

REMARKS

The present application was filed on February 6, 2004 with claims 1-24. Claims 1-7 and 9-25 are pending in the application. In the outstanding Office Action dated November 20, 2006, the Examiner has: (i) rejected claims 1-7, 9-13 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0122238 to Wu et al. (hereinafter “Wu”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,961,821 to Drake et al. (hereinafter “Drake”); and (ii) indicated that claims 14-17 and 25 are allowed.

In this response, claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice and claims 18 and 22 have been amended. Additionally, claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11-13 have been amended merely to change their dependence from claim 1 to claim 25, as necessitated by the cancellation of claim 1. Applicants traverse the §103(a) rejection, at least in part. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 18-24 stand rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Drake. With regard to these claims, the examiner contends that the combination of Wu and Drake discloses each of the features set forth therein. While Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention, claim 1 has been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of claim 1 moot. Additionally, independent claims 18 and 22 have been amended to incorporate patentable features recited in claim 25, which was acknowledged by the Examiner as being patentable.

Specifically, claim 18, as amended, further defines the method for reducing post-fabrication damage to an integrated circuit die as including the step of forming at least one chamfer, “a first perimeter edge of the chamfer being formed by the first side of the integrated circuit die, a second perimeter edge of the chamfer being formed by the second side of the integrated circuit die, and a third perimeter edge of the chamfer being formed by an upper surface of the integrated circuit die, so that the upper surface of the chamfer is substantially triangular in shape.” Likewise, claim 22, as amended, further defines the packaged integrated circuit device as including at least one chamfer arranged such that “a first perimeter edge of the chamfer is formed by the first side of the integrated circuit die, a second perimeter edge of the chamfer is formed by

the second side of the integrated circuit die, and a third perimeter edge of the chamfer is formed by an upper surface of the integrated circuit die, so that the upper surface of the chamfer is substantially triangular in shape.” The prior art fails to teach or suggest such additional features.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 18 and 22 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 18 and 22 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 and 9-13, which have been amended to depend from claim 25, claims 19-21, which depend from claim 18, and claims 23 and 24, which depend from claim 22, are believed to be patentable over the prior art by virtue of their dependency from their respective base claims, which are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons given above; claim 25 has already been allowed. Furthermore, one or more of these claims define additional patentable subject matter in their own right. For example, claims 11 and 21 further define the angle of the upper surface of the chamfer as being specifically matched to “an angle of a sidewall of a die collet configurable for receiving the die.” Although the Examiner contends that such feature is disclosed by the combination of Wu and Drake (present Office Action; page 5, paragraph 3), Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention and assert that no such disclosure can be found in any of the cited prior art references. In fact, Applicants can find no recitation of a “die collet” in the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-7, 9-13, 19-21, 23 and 24 are believed to be patentable by not merely by virtue of their dependency from their respective base claims, but also in their own right. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-7, 9-13, 19-21, 23 and 24 are respectfully solicited.

Application Serial No. 10/773,614
Art Unit: 2823

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that pending claims 2-7 and 9-25 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103 rejection.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: February 20, 2007

Wayne L. Ellenbogen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 43,602
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7662